

President, who was assassinated on November 22, 1963.

As we stood in line we looked around and could see the thousands of stone markers on the graves of the American soldiers and sailors who, also, had served their country well.

It was not long before we had the privilege of paying personal homage to President Kennedy, as millions of others had done before us. At that moment I thought it would be a good idea to visit the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier as we were nearby.

As we walked up the path leading to the site we observed a soldier with a rifle on his shoulder marching in front of the large marble tomb.

My son had been silent all this time. But then came his query, "Dad, why does that soldier march back and forth like that?"

"He is one of many honor guards who perform this duty, day and night," I answered.

Again my son asked, "Dad, what do they mean by unknown soldier?"

"During all our wars there are many soldiers who die in battle. Some of them cannot be identified. Therefore, they become unknown soldiers."

"The body of an American unknown soldier who died in World War I was placed in the tomb you are noticing. Let's look closer and see what the words on the tomb say: 'Here rests in honored glory an American soldier known but to God.'"

"Those figures carved on the tomb stand for 'valor, victory, and peace.'"

"You might also be interested to know that, in May 1958, two other bodies were placed next to the unknown soldier. They represent the men who lost their lives during World War II and the Korean conflict."

"It is on Veterans' Day and Memorial Day that special services are held on this very spot. On that day the President of the United States or his special representative places a beautiful wreath at the tomb."

"Dad, you mentioned Memorial Day, how does that fit into all of this?"

"Well, on Memorial Day, or Decoration Day, as some people call it, relatives place flowers and flags on the graves of servicemen who died in our wars. In some cities, many organizations, including Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, and fraternal groups march in military parades and take part in special patriotic programs."

"Another custom, started in recent years, is the decorating of graves on Memorial Day by the families of loved ones, even though they didn't die while in military service."

"There's one more question I'd like to ask you, Dad. How did this Memorial Day originate, anyway?"

"The historians tell us Memorial Day originated during the War Between the States when some Southern women chose May 30 to decorate soldiers' graves."

"The women honored the graves of both the Union and Confederate Armies. A Maj. Gen. John A. Logan in 1868 named May 30 as a special day for honoring the graves of unknown soldiers. Logan served as commander in chief of the Grand Army of the Republic, an organization of veterans of the Civil War. They had charge of Memorial Day celebrations in the Northern States for many years. The American Legion took over this duty after World War I."

"Is Memorial Day on May 30 a holiday in all parts of the United States?" queried my son.

"Not exactly, Memorial Day is a legal holiday in most States, Northern States, on a whole, celebrate May 30 as Memorial Day."

"Most of the Southern States have their own days for honoring the Confederate dead. Some of these days are April 26, May 10, and June 3."

As we walked in silence toward our car from the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, I could see that many thoughts were running

through my young son's mind. Suddenly, he said, "Dad, I've been thinking, why do we have to wait until Memorial Day to remember our war dead? Why can't we remember these heroes every day of the year?"

I continued my silence but one thought was repeating itself: "From the mouth of our children comes the wisdom of the ages."

MY BIRTHDAY IS JUNE 14—WHO AM I?

(By Anthony J. DelPopolo, Sr., assistant superintendent, programs, the Youth Center)

How often have you asked yourself the question: "Who am I?" But do you know who I am?

I was born on the bloody battlefields of the War for Independence in 1776; I was the creation of Francis Hopkinson, a judge of Philadelphia, and a signer of the Declaration of Independence. My early days were spent in the sewing room of Besty Ross, a seamstress, who put me together.

On June 14, 1777, I was officially adopted by the Continental Congress who resolved, "That the flag of the Thirteen United States be thirteen stripes alternate red and white, and the Union of thirteen white stars in the blue field." The 13 stars were arranged in a circle signifying the union of the States.

I flew for the first time over the victorious American troops at the battle of Saratoga in New York State.

My colors were selected with a purpose. Throughout the ages red has stood for courage and sacrifice. The red in me embodies the men who gave their lives for our country—the people who worked and sacrificed to make our country the greatest in the world. The white in me, symbolizing purity and justice and peace, stands for a country in which each true citizen endeavors to be clean in his dealings, working fairly with others, striving for a just peace throughout the world. The blue in me stands for loyalty, high quality, and preparedness.

My design as well as my colors have a deep meaning. When my red and white stripes ripple in the breeze you cannot help being struck by the impression they give in vigor and movement, by their suggestion of a dynamic country moving resolutely forward. The white stars on my blue field stand for trust in God and for the high hopes of every loyal American * * * young and old. The number of stars tell more clearly than any other part of me the story of the growth of America from the original 13 States, with a beckoning wilderness beyond, to the greatness it possesses today—with 50 stars and 50 States.

For 12 years I only had 13 stripes and 13 stars, but, in 1795, 2 extra stripes and 2 extra stars were added to me when Vermont and Kentucky, the first new States, were added to the Union. It was 17 years later when Francis Scott Key was inspired to write a song about me. He called it "The Star-Spangled Banner." He was aboard a British prisoner boat at the time, arranging for the release of a friend. Key saw me waving in the breeze on a flagpole at Fort McHenry in the Baltimore Harbor. How many of us remember his words: "Long may it wave, o'er the land of the free and the home of the brave?"

In 1818, Congress adopted a plan to keep me always with 13 stripes, and only adding white stars to my blue field as new States joined the Union. The 49th and 50th stars were added July 4, 1959, and July 4, 1960, for the new States of Alaska and Hawaii.

I have been officially changed 27 times since I was born in 1777. My exact proportions were finally established by President Woodrow Wilson when he issued an Executive order in 1916.

When you see me fly in the breeze * * * don't forget I am a reminder to our own citizens and to the people of the world of

the ideals of American democracy, of all the things for which I stand.

Let us not wait until June 14 each year to honor me or put me on display.

The idea of setting aside 1 day each year as a holiday to celebrate my adoption by the Continental Congress in 1777 was suggested by B. J. Cignand, of Batavia, Ill. Mr. Cignand, as secretary of an association which commemorated my adoption, was largely responsible for the establishment of this holiday in 1895.

This day is not a legal holiday, like the Fourth of July so the schools and banks do not close. It is observed by displaying me on all public buildings and private homes. Some schools hold special patriotic exercises in which both Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts take part.

As our Nation grew I absorbed the identity of every region of the United States. The traditions of the great Northwest, the expansiveness of the Southwest, the enterprise of the Northeast, the productivity of the Midwest, the agriculture and industry of the South and the Southeast, all are recognized in the number of stars that help to compose me—50 sovereign States bound together into a firm union by the blue of loyalty.

I have been on the frontlines of every one of our wars. Today, I proudly wave in all corners of the globe. I was up in space with Maj. James McDivitt and Edward White, who had me sewn on the left arm, of their space suits. Did you notice the blazing sun over 100 miles above the earth shine upon Major White's shoulder patch of me? How proud I was.

Francis Bellamy in August of 1892 wrote a pledge of allegiance to me which is recited by every boy and girl in school as part of the morning opening exercises. As I stand in the corner I could hear the children say: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands; one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

I am often called "Old Glory," sometimes "Stars and Stripes," and the "Star-Spangled Banner." By this time you have guessed who I am—The Flag of our United States of America.

Italian American War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1965

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, on May 19, 1965, I introduced H.R. 8273 on behalf of the Italian American War Veterans of the United States.

Today, I am happy to inform my colleagues that the 74th General Assembly of the Illinois Legislature recently passed House Joint Resolution 51 urging the Congress of the United States to enact appropriate legislation to incorporate or charter the organization known as the Italian American War Veterans of the United States.

The States of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and New York have already memorialized the Congress of the United States to grant a congressional charter and national recognition to the Italian American War Veterans of the United States.

It would be fitting indeed for the Congress to extend this long overdue recog-

June 29, 1965

dition to the members of this worthy organization who have done their share to uphold and preserve the freedom and security of the United States.

It is my pleasure to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD House Joint Resolution 51 passed by the 74th General Assembly of the State of Illinois. The resolution follows:

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 51 BY STATE OF ILLINOIS, 74TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Whereas the Italian American War Veterans of the United States is a nonprofit and nonpolitical organization made up wholly and without exception of honorably discharged American war veterans; and

Whereas the States of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and New York have memorialized the Congress of the United States to grant a congressional charter and national recognition to this most devoted group of American citizens who through their splendid patriotism have contributed so much to the security of our Nation and to the cause of freedom; and

Whereas the Legislature of the State of Illinois, a State which is so fortunate as to have many citizens of Italian origin who have nobly served our country, would like to join with the legislatures of our sister States in memorializing Congress on behalf of the Italian American War Veterans of the United States; therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 74th General Assembly of the State of Illinois, with the Senate concurring herein, respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact appropriate legislation to incorporate or charter the organization known as the Italian American War Veterans of the United States; and, be it further

Resolved, That a suitable copy of this preamble and resolution be forwarded by the Secretary of State to the presiding officer and clerk of each House of the Congress of the United States, and to each Member thereof from the State of Illinois; and to John F. Nave, past national commander of the Italian American War Veterans of the United States, Inc., and to Filippo Mazzei Post No. 1, Chicago, Ill.

Adopted by the House, May 3, 1965.

JOHN P. TOUHY,
Speaker of the House.

CHAS. F. KERWIN,
Clerk of the House.

Concurred in by the Senate, June 9, 1965.

SAMUEL H. SHAPIRO,
President of the Senate.

EDWARD E. FERNANDES,
Secretary of the Senate.

Reason Is Obvious

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1965.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Hays, Kans., News which was reprinted by the Abilene, Kans., Reflector-Chronicle and deals with a subject dear to the hearts of American housewives—rising food costs.

The editorial follows:

REASON IS OBVIOUS

A major topic of discussion for housewives today is the soaring total of the family food

bill. As any housewife can tell you, vegetables are at record highs and there is some complaint about the quality. A sampling of retail prices across the Nation shows that virtually all produce is considerably higher than a year ago.

Potatoes, lettuce, asparagus, tomatoes—you name it—and the price is up. Most food chains report prices about 15 percent above those of last spring. Tomatoes are high now and until the northern crop is harvested may be even higher. It will depend on whether or not the California crop can be harvested.

Don't blame your grocer. He's as unhappy as you are.

It all goes back to last December 31 when the administration let the so-called bracero act expire. Under this law Mexicans could enter the country to harvest vegetable and fruit crops. By barring this low-cost Mexican labor the administration hoped to create employment for American hands at higher wages.

In theory it looked good, but in practice it has been, and still is, a dud. Harvesting many of these crops is a backbreaking task. Growers have found that enough Americans, regardless of the wages offered, simply won't do this kind of work. The result is that commodities coming to market are priced high, and worse, thousands of acres of crops are rotting in the fields.

Though the Mexicans were admittedly paid low wages, they nevertheless liked the feel of American money and flocked in by the thousands when needed. Now we have few braceros, rotting crops, no Americans willing to do the work, and stiffer prices.

And with all this President Johnson has set up a vast unorganized organization to protect the American consumer and Congress is talking of launching a hearing in depth to determine why food prices have gone up.—Hays News.

Vietnam and the National Conscience

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1965

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, during these days of mounting crisis in Vietnam, the administration on the one hand is urged, by some, to escalate the war by bombing Hanoi and on the other hand, by others, to forsake our obligation by pulling out altogether from that wartorn land.

Under the onslaught of advice urging all degrees of involvement and noninvolvement, one is fortunate to hear occasionally a voice of reason which offers a perspective on the nature of our commitment in southeast Asia. Such a perspective, I am pleased to say, was furnished recently when Rev. John G. MacKinnon addressed his congregation in All Souls Unitarian Church in Indianapolis on the subject of "Vietnam and the National Conscience."

Because of the timely and highly instructive remarks made by Reverend MacKinnon on June 13, I place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of his statement:

Vietnam and the National Conscience

(A sermon by Rev. John G. MacKinnon, All Souls Unitarian Church, June 13, 1965)

Three weeks ago, Dr. John G. Stoessinger presented to this congregation what was

probably the clearest and most perfectly balanced analysis of our present problem in Vietnam that has been uttered or written. I hope you all heard it. I feel some hesitance in addressing myself to this same area of concern after you have heard this masterly discussion. However, not as an international expert, but as your minister, I feel some obligation to share with you my feelings about Vietnam and our national conscience.

I would like to begin with a couple of Dr. Stoessinger's concluding remarks. One of these I have mentioned myself from time to time, the burden of responsibility which rests upon the President of the United States in contrast to the rather easy role (because it does not involve ultimate responsibility) of us who choose to be his critics. The fact that we do not have responsibility for international decisions should not absolutely prohibit us from expressing our views, for this would shut off public debate out of which public opinion ultimately emerges. But our lack of responsibility should color our expression with humility, and it should direct us to speak with the utmost of care and mature consideration.

Dr. Stoessinger's other concluding point concerned morality. Individual morality is measured in terms of intention, but national morality only in terms of outcome. Individuals often can choose in clear terms of right versus wrong. Nations never can (or almost never). National choices in the international arena must be made in terms of different shades of gray, never in terms of black and white. A nation can never choose the wholly good, but must opt for the lesser of evils.

An article by Senator FULBRIGHT in the May 8 issue of the Saturday Review of Literature has an interesting bearing on this point. He traces two strains in the American heritage, one open and flexible, the other closed up tight about morality with a capital M. The latter, the Puritan strain, as he calls it, seeks to force a preconceived right derived from our ideology, upon others, and is, interestingly enough, exactly paralleled by Communist behavior, although their right is a different right derived from a different ideology. FULBRIGHT favors the more open and flexible approach. A thought occurred to me as I was reading his article, perhaps an extension of his thesis. The advocates of the preconceived right in our culture are divided into two separate and opposite positions. There are the advocates of the use of international force to impose our ideological right on the world, and there are those who, in the name of a personal right, morality, and goodness, decry and denounce the use of international force in any (or almost any) situation.

My position on Vietnam is—and was before I heard the tape of Dr. Stoessinger's address or read the report in the New York Times of the principle speeches at the teach-in—substantially the position advocated by Dr. Stoessinger. Vietnam is a bad, unpleasant and dubious situation. I wish we were not in it. I wish it could be terminated. I do not like to have our marines and air power engaged in killing and destruction. I am quite sure that President Johnson feels the same way. But to stay and to continue the escalation of the conflict with great care is, as I see it, the course we must follow.

I do not propose to "make a case" for our present policy which I support. Dr. Stoessinger did that quite well, while presenting the opposite case fairly also. We have had a consistent foreign policy since World War II—to contain communism and keep it from expanding to take over more countries and more people. This policy has been successfully implemented in Europe; less successfully in Asia. Unless we are to renounce it and reverse it, we must stay on in Vietnam until some political arrangement can be made which will give some hope of keeping southeast Asia free from Communist domination. The alternative is to decide that it

June 29, 1965

Approved For Release 2003/10/15 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300180017-2

A3409

doesn't matter whether communism prevails or not; or to decide that we cannot prevent its spread. I, for one, am not ready to advocate this.

I am concerned that our national policy which I support, is being portrayed by its opponents as a morally evil position; that, for example, a snide remark is made about Johnson that he looks pretty hypocritical to express his concern for people in his poverty program while killing people in Vietnam. I am concerned that this attack upon our Nation's moral posture has not been analyzed nor refuted. That is what I want to do today.

The attack upon the Nation's morality is made by honest, genuine and sincere pacifists. Pacifists are nice people who seem to stand morally above reproach in our culture. Their thesis is that to kill people is always wrong; that it is the greatest wrong and no other consideration whatsoever, of national policy or political life, can ever justify it.

Pacifists enjoy a measure of immunity in our American system, as shown by exemption of conscientious objectors from military service. Our respect for conscientiousness is such that we grant immunity from injury to one man's conscience, while demanding that a less conscientious man risk injury to his body (or loss of his life) for what we have collectively determined to be the common good. Usually this respect for conscientiousness extends to a reluctance to question motives alleged to be conscientious.

Pacifists, however, cannot operate as pacifists on the world scene. They can operate only within the structure of their own nation. Hence they oppose any use of force by their nation. This turns out to be what opponents of their nation want. In any specific situation, therefore, pacifists appear to be aligned, for whatever motives, with their nation's enemies. This is one of the crosses an honest pacifist must bear. More troublesome is the fact that he finds himself joined and supported, in his opposition to his nation, by those who are not in fact pacifists, but his nation's enemies. Pacifist conscience, is, therefore, frequently used as a respectable cloak by those who would subvert the nation's operations for political purposes. Not seldom, honest pacifists are so naive that they fail to realize that they are being used this way.

There were doubting and opposing voices raised to our Vietnam operations prior to the bombings north of the 17th parallel, but they were not very many and not very loud. Killing was going on then; killing of Vietnamese people and killing of our own troops and civilian advisors, but little protest was made by the pacifists. With the escalation of the conflict, these few, weak voices have suddenly swelled to a roaring chorus. Now killing in Vietnam by American bombs is ringingly denounced as a heinous crime. I cannot help but suspect that political voices have swelled the pacifist chorus. Content to remain quiet so long as what the United States was doing was totally ineffective politically, they swung into action (perhaps even directing the chorus) when the United States began to do something which might be politically effective.

It is no new thing for people of good will to be suckered, by clever political operators, into subversion of our Nation's program, as anyone who lived through the 30's, 40's and 50's ought to remember. I was appalled by a full page ad in the New York Times a few weeks ago, engineered by the fellowship of reconciliation and sponsored by five undistinguished clergy and our own top man, Dr. Dana Gregory. It contained the names of a thousand clergy as signers. This statement undertook to instruct President Johnson as to what was God's will. The essence of the message. "In God's name, Mr. President, stop it."

I am sure that genuine pacifists did not approve of the ruthless use of power and

violence by the Vietcong (the Communist revolutionary movement in South Vietnam) supported by the Vietminh (the Communist party in control of North Vietnam). Throughout the countryside people were forced into the ranks of this movement by the rawest sort of compulsion. Thousands of village "headmen" have been killed when they would not convert. But the genuine pacifists didn't say much about this killing; or say it very loudly. The chorus is much louder now, and it is directed exclusively against the killing by American bombs. One who has been listening might well conclude that killing by Americans is a crime; but killing by Vietcong is not. Such a thesis is explicable in politically motivated terms; but hardly on humanitarian grounds.

I note with some cynicism that the same chorus which demands that we get out of Vietnam and stop the killing there, demands that we get out of the Dominican Republic. Now, our marines didn't go into Santo Domingo shooting. There has been much less bloodshed than there would have been had our troops not been present. But this saving of life has not been praised by critics of our Nation's morality. To be sure, a certain political outcome was prevented, for the time being: the takeover of revolutionists pretty well dominated by Castro-type Communists. But curiously, the same voices by and large, that demand we get out of Vietnam and stop the killing, demand we get out of the Dominican Republic and let the killing be resumed to a political end.

Whatever the admixture of honest pacifists and subversives making up the chorus charging our Government with moral turpitude, I feel that the subversives are calling the plays. Even the honest pacifists, however, are not exclusively committed to the wrongness of killing and that alone, or they would be making more noise than they are about another kind of killing, the slaughter by automobile accidents. The number of Americans killed in Vietnam over 4 years doesn't begin to compare to the automobile death toll; not even to the Indiana death toll. It begins to compare with the increase in the Indiana death toll taking 4 years ago as a base. Yet I fail to hear an organized, cohesive demand from pacifists that we abolish automobiles to stop this killing. Of course, pacifists don't like death on the highway. Nobody does. I would guess they feel about it much as I feel about the deaths in Vietnam—I don't like it but it is a price we must pay for something we want; in the one place the convenience of automobile transportation, in the other the furtherance of our foreign policy in southeast Asia.

Another attack upon our foreign policy declares that we have no business using our military and political power to keep the people of Vietnam from having what they want. We are pictured as seeking to subdue and prevent a populace from achieving its rightful aspirations to self-government. Objection to our presence in the Dominican Republic is made on the same basis.

This begins with a great big assumption I am simply not willing to make. This is that "the people" don't want us there, don't want us to be doing what we are doing, and would prefer to have a Communist-dominated government instead. It is pretty obvious that these critics cannot be talking about all the people; for nowhere on earth are all the people of a single mind about what they want. They must be talking, therefore, about part of the people. Our Government is astute enough to recognize, if these critics are not, that the people are divided; that not all, but some of the people want us where we are, doing what we are doing. The important question, really, is how many of the people are we talking about and who are they.

The Vietnamese who are members of and active participants in the Vietcong do not want us there. Nor do those running the

Vietminh, or Communist China. The paraders in the streets of Santo Domingo (or any other Latin American or southeast Asian city) who shout, "Yankee, go home," do not want us there. Are these "the people"? Shall we forgo our concern for, and even our committee to, that portion of the people who want us there, because some of the people tell us to go home?

Critics of our Vietnam policy—both moralistic and practical—charge that from 60 to 80 percent of the people are with the Vietcong and want us to go home. Territory containing such a proportion of the inhabitants is, indeed, controlled by the Vietcong. However, in view of the manner in which the Vietcong established this control, I doubt very much that all of the people in this rebel-controlled territory want the Vietcong. Just because they have been persuaded, coerced, and compelled (by the rawest and most ruthless sort of violence) to submit to Vietcong rule, it is not fair to conclude that they want us out. I suspect that some portion of the North Vietnamese really do not want the Communist government of the Vietminh, but dictatorships always appear to enjoy political unanimity. It is quite impossible to know what proportion of the Vietnamese want us to go home, but we were invited in by their recognized and established government. We are using force to prevent the seizure of complete power by the Communist rebels, but this is not the same thing as using it to prevent the legitimate aspirations of the Vietnamese people.

Were our Government to capitulate to this sort of criticism, we would withdraw—our military forces, our economic aid, our embassies, and information libraries—the moment some Communist controlled rebel leader was able to gather enough people to pull off an impressive street demonstration, on the basis that this was the will of "the people." If he were able to get together some arms and start shooting, we would recognize him as "the people" and get out, letting him have his way and subject the people to a Communist dictatorship.

Probably almost everywhere, Vietnam included, there is a vast body of people (probably an overwhelming majority) who don't care much about political alignments. They want to be left alone to live out their lives as best they can, or to be helped to do so at a better level. On either side are small groups of power seekers who attempt to control and use this vast and largely indifferent body. If one group can muster force, draw assistance from an outside Communist sanctuary, and force its control down the throats of a large part of the mass in the middle—should we get out and let "the people" have what they want? This is not fair to the other side. It is, indeed, not fair to the large body of the indifferent middle.

I am uncomfortable, and I am sure our Government is uncomfortable, that in this sort of power struggle we often find ourselves giving support to petty reactionary forces as the only alternative to permitting a Communist takeover. I think Dr. Stoessinger pretty well analysed that problem as due to the weakness and lack of organization of the genuinely liberal and democratic forces. So, again, we cannot commit ourselves to the wholly good, but must choose the less bad of evils. But this is not a case of us against the people. In a conflict between Communist-oriented revolutionaries, and the usually reactionary establishment, we must choose to support the establishment. We happen to think—and I agree—that the people have a better chance of getting what they want if we support (often ugly) governments upon whom we can bring pressure for reform, than if we bow out to let the Communists takeover. I reject the charge that we are suppressing the people and keep-

ing them from fulfilling their rightful national aspirations

The practical case against our Vietnam policy is, to me, much more impressive than the alleged moral case. Dr. Stoessinger gave this the full treatment. It holds we should give up and get out because we are licked. We cannot contain communism in Asia from our peripheral position. Ultimately communism will take over by historical necessity. We are spreading ourselves too thin and will exhaust our resources. If I were ready to be convinced that our policy is wrong, it would be on these grounds. However I am not yet ready to agree that we cannot bring at least a stalemate out of this present mess. I was much interested and encouraged to hear what Dr. Stoessinger had to say about the viability of a Korea-type or a Laos-type settlement; and the possibility, after a long hot summer of no decision, of working toward such a solution. Perhaps we can't contain communism in Asia forever—but if we can do so for 20 years, there may develop in China, as there has in Russia, a kind of communism with which the non-Communist world can live. This practical consideration is open to rational discussion, as the incensed charges of immorality are not.

Conscience is a vulnerable point for Americans; because Americans are a conscientious people. I suspect we are conscientious, not only because of our Puritan strain, but also because we have a respect for moral goodness; i.e., we are a people committed to the creation and increase of human values. To charge our Government with moral turpitude is a blow that hurts. It not only hurts but it is apt to shake our commitment to a well-thought-out policy. If it is not justified in fact, I'm ready to call "foul."

I am distressed to find so many fellow liberals charging our Government with moral turpitude. I was distressed to see the name of my colleague, Dana Greeley, and the names of some 14 other colleagues (down through F in the alphabet) declaring God's judgment upon our President for his moral turpitude. I wonder if it was because Goldwater advocated certain measures in Vietnam, that it has now become a liberal syndrome to declare that our Vietnam policy is morally wrong. If I must say that in order to be a genuine liberal, I guess I'll have to resign from the club after nearly a lifetime of membership in good standing.

I reject this charge of moral turpitude leveled against our Government's policy in Vietnam. I reject it because I believe it to be tainted with immoral considerations, itself. It is being used, by those who oppose our policy on political grounds, as a safe vantage point from which to make their attack. Many with clean hearts are being dragged into this position, either through their single-minded vision of the right (the Puritan complex) or through simple naivete.

I reject this charge, in the second place, because it is an erroneous charge. It is erroneous because it fails to take into account the distinction between individual and national morality. This charge is based upon the criterion of national morality—outcome. Were this attack to succeed in changing our policy, the inevitable outcome would be a prompt and immediate Communist takeover. I believe, the Government believes, and honestly I think a good many of the moral attackers believe, too, that this would be the worse of the evils between which we much choose.

As for the honestly pure in heart—I respect their purity. I shall support their relative immunity as conscientious pacifists. I envy them their moral certitude that they are right. But I must disregard them as irrelevant to make judgments in terms of personal morality on issues of national morality. Meanwhile our Government—with ultimate responsibility resting upon our President—cannot afford the luxury of this pristine per-

sonal morality. And our Nation, and the people within it, must resist this attack upon its moral integrity. It must do, and the people must ultimately concur or it cannot go on doing it, what it has to do: make its choice for the 75 percent good, or even only the 55 percent good in terms of expected outcome; then sweat it out, hoping that the turn of events will ultimately show that choice to have been, in fact, for 55 percent good instead of 75 percent bad.

I refuse to have the moral integrity of my Government, and its leadership impugned without an argument. I reject these charges of immorality, colored as they are by political considerations, and based as they are upon a personal concept of morality. In terms of national morality, I say that my Government is as morally right as, in this moment of history, it is possible to be.

Score Another for Nasser

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1965

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply distressed to learn that President Johnson had determined to proceed with the shipment of \$37 million worth of surplus agricultural commodities to the United Arab Republic on the basis that relations between the United Arab Republic and the United States had improved in recent months. The views expressed in the following editorial of the Chicago American reflect the feeling of many thoughtful Americans that Nasser has not proved reliable in the past and cannot be counted upon today to promote peace and amity among nations:

SCORE ANOTHER FOR NASSER

Dictator Gamal Abdel Nasser has won another argument with the United States. He has told us to "go drink seawater"—which is Egyptian for "go to hell"—because we thought he ought to stop giving arms and other assistance to the Congo rebels. The rebels were slaughtering captured Americans and Europeans.

The House of Representatives, for once responding to injury and insult as Americans used to, voted last February to forbid all American aid to Egypt, but after President Johnson applied pressure, the Senate weakened and left it to Mr. Johnson to decide in favor of aid to Egypt if he thought the aid was in the American national interest.

Now President Johnson has decided it is in the interests of America to help Dictator Nasser aggrandize himself. The Agriculture Department is issuing authorization for the purchase of \$37 million worth of wheat, vegetable oils, dried milk, and tobacco. This will be given to the Egyptians.

Egypt will put up the equivalent of \$37 million in Egyptian money to pay for the food, knowing that the United States will hand back 90 percent of it for the Egyptian Government to spend on new roads or public works. The remaining 10 percent will be used to pay U.S. expenses in Egypt.

The State Department says Nasser has stopped furnishing aid to the Communist rebels in the Congo; this may be true or it may not. In North Vietnam it probably will be believed that he is still helping the Communist forces in the Congo, as he said he would when he was telling us to go to hell. And the North Vietnamese will construe our

weakness toward Nasser as evidence that the United States always weakens before it really gets tough with anybody.

And this will encourage the North Vietnam Communists to continue their warfare against South Vietnam on the theory that they will eventually win it, notwithstanding our bombing raids and our buildup of troops.

Why give Dictator Nasser in Egypt tender treatment that will encourage another dictator, Ho Chi Minh, across the continent of Asia in Hanoi?

Mr. "Mickey"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1965

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the death last week of C. Walter "Mickey" McCarty, executive editor of the Indianapolis News, is deeply mourned by all who knew this truly great giant of Hoosier journalism.

"Mickey" performed more than half a century of service to Hoosiers. He went through the ranks from reporter to editor and still found time to write a much-read column "Fellow Taxpayers." Few men on the Hoosier scene have been the equal of "Mickey" McCarty, with his great wit, deep understanding and love of humanity.

Few great civic undertakings in Indianapolis lacked the leadership of "Mickey."

The following editorials reflect to a small degree the many contributions he made to his profession and to his State, and the loss that all who knew him feel at his passing:

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) News, June 24, 1965]

Mr. "MICKEY"

Reporter, city editor, and civic leader, managing editor, toastmaster, publisher, executive editor, and university trustee, C. Walter McCarty was all these and much more.

To those who knew him as an acquaintance or friend or fellow taxpayer, he was a delightful Irishman whose wit was legendary and unique.

To those who believed in and worked for the future of Indianapolis and Indiana, as he did, he was a faithful ally in all endeavors and a sage and sane adviser in civic planning and execution.

To those who had chosen his profession of newspapering, he was a rare combination of reporter and writer, editor and counselor, columnist and quiet but competent critic.

And he gave unstintingly of his energies, time and abilities to his beloved Indiana University.

But above all else, excepting only his family, his life was wrapped up in the Indianapolis News. For it, he originated the phrase "the A paper" and for all his adult life—a full and productive half-century—he worked to establish and maintain the News as "the paper."

To Mr. "Mickey," the News was always "the Great Hoosier Daily, the A paper, circulation and advertising rates on request." And it was and is just that, "the A paper," to his countless thousands of friends, and, particularly, to those of us who were fortunate enough to have been in the newsroom with him.

trators, the National Safe Boating Association, the National Safety Council, the Outboard Boating Club of America, the U.S. Power Squadrons, the Yacht Safety Bureau, and the Young Men's Christian Association. To all of these organizations safety in pleasure boating is as important as it is to the individual and his family.

To all those national and local committees actively participating in National Safe Boating Week, I extend my congratulations. I urge all others interested in boating safety to join in making this an even more effective National Safe Boating Week than the successful ones in the past.

FE ~~WV~~ Albert OUR POLICY IN VIETNAM

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the use of terror against innocent persons is condemned by this country and by all civilized people. Although there is no proof that Sergeant Bennett was executed as claimed—he may well have been dead for months—the announcement of his having been executed in violation of human ethics is a blatant attempt to terrorize the American people. The bombing of a restaurant in Saigon is likewise an indication of the extent to which North Vietnam is going in order to impose its undesired rule in South Vietnam. As Secretary Rusk suggested last week, this is going to be a long monsoon season and there will be many casualties. We must be prepared for them, including assaults upon the innocent who are the stated targets of the Vietcong.

The Vietcong is strengthened by the direction and material support it receives from the Communist regime in Hanoi which now has infiltrated at least 40,000 men into the Republic of Vietnam. Recent intelligence reports confirm the presence of a minimum of one regular battalion of the North Vietnamese Army and there is now possibly a full division of North Vietnamese regulars in South Vietnam. This stepped-up activity has created an imbalance between the South Vietnamese Army and the Vietcong, with the result that the South Vietnamese people could not be provided sufficient security against Vietcong terror.

But these tactics will not cause us to weaken our resistance to the takeover of South Vietnam. Nor will they incite us to reprisals for acts of terror. We shall stand firm. There is no doubt that our air forces will continue to apply pressures and perhaps increased pressures, against North Vietnam against legitimate military targets. The choice of targets, forces the question of a naval quarantine, are military judgments to which our best experts are applying themselves. We might be justified in imposing a naval blockade or in extending our air strikes. But if we do undertake these steps, our decision will rest upon sound, rational military and poli-

tical judgments. We will not act in anger, or wantonly retaliate in the Communist manner against innocent civilian population centers. And we will act within the framework of the President's repeated assertion that we seek no wider war. The guidelines laid down by the President must be taken into account in deciding all questions of tactics and particularly whether to internationalize the effect of our naval operations by imposing any kind of blockade.

The United States and other allies have augmented the free world's strength in South Vietnam by furnishing combat troops who undertake carefully selected operations in certain zones so that the South Vietnamese Army is thereby better able to provide security for the populace. Our troops are engaging the Vietcong only in certain delineated situations such as base security by static defense or patrolling, or where Vietnamese forces are inadequate to accomplish a vital task. This is not a commitment to a massive land war, but rather the judicious employment of our forces in areas where our men and their firepower are most effective. Our objective is to deter aggression from Hanoi in two ways; first, by convincing her that the game is not worth the candle, and secondly, by convincing her that even increased infiltration and terror cannot snatch South Vietnam from its place in the ranks of independent nations.

The Government of South Vietnam continues to take casualties in order to stave off the vicious drive being mounted against their independence. Our troops are there to assist them and they are needed. Neither air nor naval power, necessary though they are, can totally replace these men. The fighting is going to be hard and we cannot hope for instant cessation of terrorist activities. The difficulty of the undertaking is outweighed by the profound significance of the issue. Our President has said that we stand ready to talk without any prior conditions—yet we will not yield and we will prevail.

RHODE ISLAND LITHUANIAN RESOLUTION

(Mr. FOGARTY (at the request of Mr. Hicks) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, just a short time ago it was my privilege to join in the commemoration of the 25th anniversary of the occupation of the Baltic States. At that time a number of us expressed our sentiment here on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives. It was an attempt, Mr. Speaker, to bring to the attention of the world the sad plight of the freedom-loving Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians.

With this same purpose in mind I include in my remarks a resolution of the Providence chapter of the American Lithuanian Council of Providence, R.I., which was sent to me by the Rev. Vaclovas Martinkus, chairman, and John A. Stoskus, secretary of that organization.

PROVIDENCE CHAPTER, AMERICAN LITHUANIAN COUNCIL, Providence, R.I.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FOGARTY: Rhode Islanders of Lithuanian extraction gathered on June 20, 1965, at Saint Casimir's Auditorium in the city of Providence in solemn commemoration of the 25th anniversary of the occupation of Lithuania by Soviet Russia, unanimously passed the following resolution:

Whereas Soviet communism has demonstrated by principle and by act that its whole purpose is the domination of the world by the proletariat through the ruthless destruction and annihilation of all existing forms of government; and

Whereas the Soviet Union took Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia by force of arms; and

Whereas Soviet communism is bent on only one purpose, its victory and experience has shown that the victory of Soviet communism means very concretely the enslavement of all other peoples; and

Whereas Soviet Russia has deported nearly 400,000 Lithuanian citizens to concentration camps in Siberia and other areas of Soviet Russia for slave labor and death; and

Whereas Lithuanians, Estonians, and Latvians sincerely desire, fight and die for their national independence and liberation; and

Whereas Lithuania has been for over 20 years unjustly subjugated by Soviet Russia which has to this date steadfastly refused to permit the people of Lithuania to hold free elections: Now be it

Resolved, That we thank the President of the United States, Members of the U.S. Senate, and Members of the U.S. House of Representatives for their many kindnesses shown the Lithuanian cause, which caused the free world to recall and keep in mind the atrocities committed upon Lithuania and other Baltic nations by Soviet Russia; and be it

Resolved, That our Government take immediate and concrete steps to compel Soviet Russia to leave the territory of Lithuania, to return free elections in Lithuania under the supervision of the United Nations; and be it further

Resolved, That the representatives of free Lithuania be given a full-fledged seat in the United Nations which would permit her to state her righteous case to the world.

Rev. VACLAVAS MARTINKUS,
Chairman.

JOHN A. STOSKUS,
Secretary.

(Mr. BINGHAM (at the request of Mr. Hicks) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. BINGHAM'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

A WORTHWHILE HOUSING PROGRAM

(Mr. OTTINGER (at the request of Mr. Hicks) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, the legislation before us today—the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965—is not perfect. No legislation is. But this is a good bill, containing many and it certainly deserves our support.

As a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I know how much time and bipartisan effort went into making this bill as good as it is. I

want to particularly commend the chairman of the committee [Mr. PATMAN], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing [Mr. BARRETT] and the ranking minority member of the committee [Mr. WIDNALL] for their leadership in working out an effective, comprehensive program.

There has been considerable controversy, both in and out of Congress, over section 101 of this bill, the rent subsidy provision. When this provision was discussed in committee, I voiced reservations about it, mainly because I felt at that time the legislation did not contain adequate safeguards against the subsidy program being applied too broadly. We just do not have money enough to subsidize housing for everyone in this country, and while I can support assistance to provide housing for the very poor, I did not think, with hundreds of thousands of impoverished people still in slum housing, we should go further.

In response to my reservations and those of other Congressmen, the administration has revised the bill so that now only those persons who qualify for public housing will be eligible for rent supplements. This satisfies my objections and make this section a very worthy experiment to better deal with the housing needs of the poor.

It is important to note that the present public housing program simply has failed to do the job of providing decent, safe and sanitary housing for American families afflicted with poverty. Today in the United States there are more than 3 million families living in substandard housing who have incomes too low for decent private housing in their communities.

In addition, there are more than 2 million elderly or handicapped lacking decent housing, and each year 80,000 families are displaced by some kind of Government action.

Since the public housing program started, only 580,000 units have been built. Today, 500,000 families are on waiting lists for public housing units. The rent supplement program gives us another tool to meet the need for housing without getting us into a federally operated housing program of incredible proportions. The rent supplement program enables us to meet the housing needs of low-income families through the private sector of the economy, and this is certainly a laudable approach.

Despite the fact that Westchester County, N.Y., which I represent, is one of the Nation's three most affluent counties on a per capita basis, for many years it has been confronted with the problem of slums and decay and poverty in the midst of gracious, attractive communities. The 1960 census revealed that 6.5 percent of the dwellings in the county, housing some 50,000 persons, were substandard. It also revealed an unfortunate connection between substandard housing, old housing, rental housing, nonwhite occupancy, and low income. In the three largest cities of Westchester—Yonkers, Mount Vernon, and New Rochelle—32 percent of the nonwhite rental units were classified as substandard and 7½ percent of the rental units occupied by whites were substandard.

Mr. Speaker, a program which provides housing that is privately sponsored, privately built, and privately financed under FHA will meet important needs in New York's 25th Congressional District, as I am sure it will in many areas of the Nation.

A vote for this program is a vote for breaking the vicious, continuing cycle of poverty in the world's richest nation.

THE NEW LOOK IN FOREIGN AID

(Mr. JOELSON (at the request of Mr. Hicks) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, one of the most persistent cries we hear about foreign aid is that it is always the same. We keep giving the same people the same huge amounts of money with the same lack of results. The program is fine in principle, but it needs a new look. We need some way to make those so and so's who administer it stop being so soft-hearted and do the job right.

These cries almost entirely ignore the significant changes in direction that the foreign aid program has made in the past. In 1948 the Marshall plan was created to assist in the reconstruction of Europe. In the 1950's the program changed to build up, largely with military aid and supporting assistance, free world defenses against direct aggression such as that in Korea. In the last few years the program has changed its focus again—to meet the long-term challenge of building nations that can stand on their own feet.

It is not surprising that these changes have gone unnoticed because so much of the public discussions of aid is so uninformative and because the changes are much more noticeable over a period of years than they are from year to year.

The important point, however, is that there is a new look to foreign aid. We are today devoting a much higher percentage of our funds and energies to the basic job of development than ever before and we are beginning to see the kind of results that make this kind of aid worthwhile. One significant indicator of this change in direction is that despite Vietnam we are today spending \$1 billion less for military and supporting assistance than we did in 1960 and 1961.

This is not the only change that has taken place in the past 3 years. Foreign aid today is better planned and better managed than it has ever been before.

Perhaps the most important single aspect of the new look in foreign aid is the emphasis on self-help. This is not just a slogan but a recognition of the practical fact that what a country does with its own resources has a greater impact on its development than what is done with the resources we are able to provide. These countries themselves provide \$6 toward development for every \$1 which we provide. In order to make as rapid progress as possible we have been paying more and more attention to the total economy of the country and using our aid in increasingly sophisticated ways to insure that the countries

themselves are doing the right things. Last year we used the leverage of our large program loans to Brazil, Chile, and Pakistan to secure commitments to needed basic reforms—in Pakistan to a free import system for raw materials for private industry, in Brazil and Chile to specific measures for holding down inflation. This emphasis on self-help is beginning to pay off and we expect to get better at it as time goes on.

The emphasis on self-help has lead directly to another new emphasis—concentration. Today more than ever before we are seeking to concentrate our aid—to concentrate it on the countries which are doing the most to help themselves and within those countries to concentrate our aid on the critical sectors. Two-thirds of all development assistance today goes to just seven countries.

Another important aspect of the new look in foreign aid is the emphasis now being made on private enterprise. The range of incentives to private enterprise, such as guarantees, loans, and other forms of assistance, is much broader than it was just a few years ago. This is perhaps seen most dramatically in the increasingly rapid rate at which specific risk investment guarantees are being issued. Last year—calendar 1964—AID issued \$707.8 million of these guarantees as opposed to just \$63.7 million in 1960.

In the past few years there has also been a significant increase in the amount of free world cooperation on aid matters. We have put a great deal of pressure on our allies to contribute more aid and to contribute their aid on better terms. We still have not done all we would like on this but have met with considerable success. We have taken the lead in increasing the resources directly administered by the World Bank, IDA, and similar institutions and in organizing the major international groups concerned with aid matters, the DAC, the Alliance for Progress, CIAP, the international consortia to coordinate aid to India and Pakistan, and elsewhere. All of these efforts are improving the effectiveness with which our aid and that of our allies is being used and we hope to be able to continue the leadership we have been supplying in this field.

The new look in AID also includes an increased emphasis on strict management. Better quality people are being sought through increased use of contracting out and through an upgrading of personnel. The total number of personnel has been reduced by nearly 1,100 in the past year. Significant cost reductions have been made in a number of areas. ICA and DLF procedures have been brought together and improved. And a significant amount of decentralization has been effected. There are still improvements to be made in this area. One which is being worked on now is an improvement in the management reporting system.

The new look also includes a number of measures taken in the past few years which reduce the cost of the program to the United States.

Today the program is more than two-thirds loans repayable in dollars as opposed to two-thirds grants in 1959. Last

ernment and manufacturers. They will surely have a more important place in the program as time goes on.

There appears to be unanimous agreement among the major U.S. airlines that a U.S. supersonic aircraft should be designed and built even though the program will be very costly and will require some years for accomplishment. This in spite of the fact that aircraft manufacturers have been analyzing the potential of the supersonic transport in depth since the midfifties. NASA and other research agencies have likewise been carrying on extensive research and testing for a like period of time.

The program to date has demonstrated to the airlines that the state of the art for both the aircraft and its powerplants is quite fluid. Great progress is currently being made in aerodynamics, advanced turbine engine design, and in the fabrication of new structural materials. However, the optimization of configurations, systems, and controls is a long way from resolution. Perhaps the one common agreement between the manufacturers is that titanium is the best basic airframe material for the U.S. vehicle.

Continuing competition between vendors has been a primary factor in achieving the outstanding safety, economy, and operational performance and reliability of our present jet aircraft. If the civil jets had been developed on the plan originally proposed for the supersonic transport, that is, first, picking a single design from initial competitive proposals; second, writing detailed contract specifications; and third, proceedings directly with a firm development and production program, the resulting aircraft would have been handicapped with inferior operational and safety characteristics and poorer economic potentials than are available in current aircraft. This would have been true even though the original contract specifications had been met, since these would have been developed and agreed upon when there was no certainty in most of the essential parameters.

Without other directly competitive aircraft becoming available for comparison it would have been impossible to prove to a "single source" manufacturer, or to the Government, that higher degrees of perfection were possible than those minimal performance and operational criteria which he was willing to guarantee before the fact.

Further, there is no stimulus equal to that of direct competition for the attainment of design perfection in every technical area. Engineers work harder and with greater efficiency when they realize that their efforts are to be compared, component by component, with those of other competent designers in their own field. Such competitive incentive represents an economic gain that cannot be otherwise gained. It has real monetary value and is a direct benefit accruing from the free enterprise system.

As a specific example of the value of competition in the development of civil aircraft, it will be recalled that while the Boeing model 80—prototype—was very instrumental in demonstrating the

reasonableness and potentials of the large jet airplane to the airlines, its configuration was significantly altered in the production model 707, primarily as the result of the competitive Douglas DC-8 design and airline criticism. Both aircraft types have had a continuing experience of design changes to make them more useful and economical. Safety has been a consideration in some of these. Major revisions have been made in performance, powerplants, high-lift devices, and controls. Each improvement has been stimulated by the continuing competition between these very alert, aggressive, and competent companies, and aided by the active cooperation of major airline engineering organizations. The military counterpart, the KC-135, has essentially maintained its original configuration and performance.

To establish such a competitive atmosphere it is necessary that at least two competent, relatively equal potential sources of supply be available and eager to participate. Fortunately this condition is satisfactory in the present supersonic transport program.

A further requirement is that the competitors be permitted freedom in the modification of design details for the purpose of improvement so as to make the vehicle more useful and attractive to the potential customers, yet meet the basic minimal contract provisions.

The safe and economic propulsion of the supersonic transport is such a significant factor that the airlines generally agree that as of now the development of a satisfactory powerplant requires more extensive development and testing than does the airframe. There has been no adequate military engine development to pave the way for the civil powerplant as has been true in the past. Most airlines will urge that both Pratt & Whitney and General Electric be permitted to extend their research and development efforts, since neither have yet built engines with demonstrated capabilities for longtime exposure to the temperatures and stresses associated with civil supersonic transport operations. The element of competition between the two further insures the achievement of an acceptable powerplant sooner. Beyond that initial step for "prototype" and "first production" aircraft, the engines will require continuing development and refinement. The competitive incentive is very important for this latter phase also.

Most airlines are very conscious of the need for having competitive supersonic transport aircraft in the prototype stages, and also in the production program. It seems certain that the supersonic transport, as with past civil transport aircraft, will require various configurations to satisfy the needs of various services—for example, "domestic versus international." It would be extremely shortsighted to assume that there will be only one U.S. supersonic transport. At this time, it appears that the Boeing design may be preferable in some applications, while the Lockheed will be best for others. These are matters that cannot be proven on paper or by computers.

Prototypes of each are essential to the making of good airline judgments.

Any particular configuration of the supersonic transport will develop most advantageously when the prime manufacturer seeks and utilizes the continuing advice of the purchaser's—airlines—engineering talent, with the manufacturer retaining the responsibility of final design decisions. He must eventually demonstrate and guarantee minimum safety and performance to the Government—FAA—and insure his eventual customers—the airlines—of satisfactory safety, performance, and economical potentials. These will all need to be substantiated to the customer by means of adequate operational guarantees and warranties.

This is a drastically different situation from the usual military contracts where Government representatives often make design change decisions and thereby accept, for the Government, certain responsibilities for performance and delays occasioned by such changes. With military aircraft minimum performance to accomplish a given mission is the primary objective. Operational costs and efficiency are secondary. In airline operations the order is reversed. This represents an important difference in approach, and relationship between the manufacturer and his purchasers, military and civil.

Minimum performance, operational and safety standards are reasonably well outlined in the original FAA request for proposals dated August 15, 1963. They relate primarily to definitely measurable quantities such as minimum payload to be carried over a given distance at a given speed, airport performance, certain limitations as to sonic boom, minimum operational fuel reserves and safety requirements, plus stipulation of minimums for passenger seat spacing and cargo accommodations. True, many other desirable characteristics are discussed in a general way in the RFP, but are intended primarily for guidance rather than being exact specifications.

The FAA request for proposal requirements were quite adequate for the initial phase I bids and with modifications are serving satisfactorily for the competitive phase II-A and II-B studies and bids. Great technical progress has been demonstrated since January 15, 1964, largely as the result of advances in the state of the art and the incentives provided by competition between the two major airframe bidders and the two major engine producers.

As stated earlier, it seems essential that direct competition between the present airframe and engine builders be continued into phase III and to the building of competitive flying prototypes to insure earlier optimization of those factors and features which exercise great leverage on the profit—or loss—potentials. From these, the airlines can then make their decisions and execute contracts with the manufacturers with some degree of assurance that safe, efficient and economical aircraft can be presented to the public.

Competition provides a continuing leverage to further improve the product, whereas freezing of design and performance requirements prevents taking advantage of later developments. Therefore the contracts should be kept reasonably flexible so that when both parties agree that changes are desirable, such can be incorporated.

It is believed that the bigger the stakes and the more costly the enterprise, the more essential it is that direct competition be employed in order to attain the highest possible refinements at reasonable costs. It has been calculated that a difference in payload break-even point of 5 percent—50 percent versus 55 percent—represents a probable \$2.4 billion differential in profit for a fleet of 100-supersonic transport aircraft operating over a period of 10 years. Continuing competition can represent potential differences in the ultimate break-even load factor of the supersonic transport aircraft considerably in excess of the 5-percent example represented above.

Out of the supersonic transport effort there will come many benefits which cannot be anticipated or evaluated at this time. This was true for every advance which has been made in air transportation during the past 35 years. Therefore we must proceed with the supersonic transport at this time. But in doing so there must be an understanding that the development of these craft will be evolutionary rather than revolutionary. Every step of the way will be accomplished as the result of a series of cut and try approximations, even though each of these will have the benefit of the latest computer techniques, applying the most precise and sophisticated test information.

The eventual cost and value of achieving the ultimate in this next big step in air transportation cannot be determined at this time with great accuracy, but this should not deter us in our understanding that the eventual accomplishment will be a valid contribution to a better world. We must go ahead to see ahead.

FE *Adair*
AID PROGRAM TO SEND COLLEGE GRADUATES TO SOUTH VIETNAM AS "INTERNS"

(Mr. ADAIR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, in Vietnam today we are facing a foe with many years of experience in guerrilla war. This so-called war of national liberation is even now reaching a new high in intensity. Therefore, it was with amazement that I learned last week that the Agency for International Development is sending approximately 20 college graduates to South Vietnam for the summer as interns.

I seriously question the desirability of throwing these untrained students into Vietnam during the rainy season at the height of Vietcong activity. AID informs me that these people are to go to provincial centers as some sort of assistant. Now we do not have members of the Peace Corps in Vietnam due to

the danger there. They were withdrawn from Indonesia due to the tense relations with that nation. Why, I ask you, should untrained people be now sent into what is a combat situation? What can these students accomplish that others could not? Why needlessly risk their lives? This is the equivalent of sending soldiers with a week's basic training into combat.

Now, if you think this picture is somewhat overdrawn, let me assure you that this is not the case. This idea was hatched just this month in AID. In fact, it was done in such a hasty manner that the organization that obtained the contract to recruit these students didn't know exactly what to tell the college students they were interviewing. Students indicating an interest in going to Vietnam were flown to Washington for hasty processing. As I speak now, some of them may be already on their way to Vietnam.

How did AID accomplish this? They awarded an \$85,000 contract to the Institute of International Education in New York. It is of more than passing interest to note that this institute received some \$5 million in 1964 from the State Department to aid in their operations for the next 2 years. Their contract is to cover the cost of recruiting and processing these students. Incident to this contract some 60 students were flown to Washington for interviews.

Now there are other costs. Each student will cost the taxpayer about \$2,000 for the summer. For pay, they will receive \$12 per diem in Vietnam and \$16 a day while in the United States. This is considerably better pay than our infantrymen receive in Vietnam, I might add. The amount of money spent on this program, I believe, could better be applied to the training of AID personnel who have accepted long-term contracts. One trained person in the field is worth many students, however highly motivated they may be.

When I asked AID about this program they told me that they hoped that some of the people who go there this summer will become enthusiastic enough about the program that at some future date they will sign up for permanent contracts when their schooling is completed.

My primary concern is that they live to complete their schooling. AID is extremely vague concerning the safety of these people. In a Washington briefing for these students, run jointly by AID and the Institute of International Education, the thought was expressed that the Vietcong usually do not attack the AID people. However, recall that President Johnson said on May 13 of this year:

Communist terrorists have made AID programs that we administer a very special target of their attack. They fear them because agricultural stations are being destroyed and medical centers are being burned. More than 100 Vietnamese malaria fighters are dead. Our own AID (Agency for International Development) officials have been wounded and kidnapped. These are not just the accidents of war. They are a part of a deliberate campaign in the words of the Communists "to cut the fingers off the hands of the Government."

AID has further said that they hope to secure insurance for these students. One can only wonder what insurance company will cover this sort of risk at what rate?

This is one of the most questionable programs that has come to my attention in many years. Like so many other things connected with our foreign aid program it smacks of hasty planning and poor judgment. It ought not to be allowed to continue.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I compliment the gentleman for calling this to the attention of the House. I believe it is most unfortunate that the administration would even consider the proposal to which the gentleman has alluded today.

Mr. ADAIR. I thank the gentleman.

AMERICA'S ROLE IN AIRCRAFT DEVELOPMENT

(Mr. WOLFF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I have recently returned from representing the United States at the International Air Space Exhibition. I went to the exhibition as a member of the House of Representatives Space Committee, and what I learned there has impressed upon me once again that America cannot afford to falter in the development of new air and spacecraft.

The Russians once again attempted to grab the propaganda advantage from us with their giant 700-passenger transport, the globe-circling Vostok spacecraft, and a huge vertical takeoff plane capable of lifting a fully loaded bus.

Other European countries showed tremendous progress in the development of a whole range of advanced craft from a supersonic jet that takes off vertically to sleek, well-designed airliners which will pose an increasing threat to the sale of airplanes of American manufacture.

The United States cannot afford to lose the space race, but we also cannot afford to lose the aeronautical race that we have so long led. Foreign aircraft manufacturers have shown a vitality and ingenuity in their designs that we must match if we are to maintain our international standing and our leading position in the world aircraft market.

These hard facts of life were deeply impressed upon all of us who attended the exhibition at Le Bourget.

New aircraft designs such as the supersonic transport, V/TOL and jet helicopters must match our achievements in space. We must explore every possibility in the design and development of advanced types of aircraft. The know-how and equipment to develop these planes are already available in areas like Long Island which has been producing first-line aircraft for many years.

As a member of the Science and Astronautics Committee, I intend to redouble my efforts to see that America maintains her place of world leadership in aeronautical progress.